28th January 1929]

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the negative.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (*d*) of question No. 655 given on 22nd October 1927 under question No. 833 from which it will be seen that certain areas were not included in the ayacut of the Pedalanka channel. The Government are not aware that as a consequence many ryots became poor.

(*c*) So far as the Government are aware the lands were not relinquished. The special division which is proposed to be sanctioned from 1st April 1929, for the investigation of the "Short crop" scheme in the Kistna delta will consider the question of the inclusion in the short crop ayacut of the lands not included under the Pedalanka channel.

Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao :—"May I know whether it is a fact that in the tail end of the channel, on account of want of repairs, the ryots are suffering very much ?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"It is not a question of lack of water but it is one of too much of water. The drainage is defective."

Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao :—"I am speaking of the want of repairs to the channel in the tail end ?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"Repairing the channel won't help them if arrangements are not made for the large volume of drainage water to be discharged into the sea with sufficient quickness."

Damages to roads in Cocanada by the recent rains.

*1007 *Q.*—Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether large volumes of water from the uplands and other areas flowed through the Yeleru bridge of Cocanada during the recent rains ; and

(*b*) whether on account of the inundation the adjacent roads were washed away ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the Executive Engineer's report, dated 1st November 1928, which has been laid on the table[a] along with the Collector's reports on the floods in Vizagapatam and East Godavari. The Government have no further information on the matter.

Alleged modifications in the supply of water by turns to the irrigation channels from the Lower Anicut.

*1008-A *Q.*—Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddiyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Lower Anicut was intended more for the benefit of the South Arcot district than for that of the Tanjore district ;

(*b*) whether any alterations or modifications in supplying water in turns (at the Lower Anicut) to the different irrigation channels originating from the Lower Anicut have recently been effected by the Public Works Department ;

(*c*) if so, when and why ;

---

a Laid on the table on 26th November 1928.